

Date: Wed, 9 Jun 93 04:30:16 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #178  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Wed, 9 Jun 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 178

Today's Topics:

                    Blind VE's, A Clarification  
                                blind VEs (2 msgs)  
            Need to have your license in Minnesota (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: 8 Jun 1993 23:26:34 -0500  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!doc.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-  
mail@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Blind VE's, A Clarification  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Greetings Again:

After my last article to this newsgroup I was emailed by a gentleman and  
chastized for "strident millitancy." I want to make myself absolutely clear on  
this subject, so I'm posting my response to his letter. I have not posted his  
email because I believe in privacy and would not post someone else's email to me  
without first asking permission.

No, not every person who disagrees with me is a bigot, and I didn't  
imply that they were. Read on!

Subject: Re: blind VEs  
From: The Monster of Peladon <aggedor@doc.cc.utexas.edu>  
Content-Type: text

Content-Length: 5617

Dear Sir:

Let me first agree completely with you. We all have different life experiences. One way to gain that experience is to open your mind and learn from others. Granted that sometimes the information is not easy to come by, so there is certainly an excuse in a lot of cases for not knowing something.

But that doesn't apply to the current situation. Both Mike Freeman and myself have written articles on how blind VE's are capable of fulfilling all of the duties that might be required. In fact we both went into great detail concerning this. We did it because we wanted people to understand the reasoning behind our objection to the FCC ruling. We knew that most of the general population is unaware of the alternative techniques of blindness, and we wished to educate our fellow amateurs, so that they would perceive that which we perceived.

But despite our best efforts, people kept coming out of the woodwork, making it necessary time and again, for us to keep pointing out what we had pointed out before. The article that I responded to was obviously written by someone who had been reading the "blind VE" thread for quite some time. He was not uninformed concerning our reasoning, yet he still chose to write an article which I felt was offensive. As I indicated in my reply to his article, we the blind have heard all of this before. The excuses, the rationalizing, the pseudo-logic.

There is a vast difference, Sir, between someone who is uninformed and someone who is unwilling to be informed. I responded to this gentleman in kind, I felt. I found his paternalism and his sarcasm to be offensive in the extreme, and I replied in frank terms. I do not apologize for this.

There are still large numbers of people who believe that blind people are not, and never will be the equals of the sighted. Through my experiences I have discovered to my delight, that given the proper training, the blind are perfectly capable of competing on terms of equality with their sighted neighbors. Yes, there are certain jobs that we are incapable of doing, and we do not propose to attempt these, such as truck driver or jet pilot (as you pointed out). But every day it seems, we are blazing new trails in the world of work. I myself do a job which would have been considered impossible twenty, or even ten years ago. We are slowly taking our rightful place alongside our sighted peers in the larger community. Despite the erroneous assumptions of the abovementioned people, things are changing, and we move ever closer to equality.

But do not think that we will stand idly by and let the gains that we have so painstakingly obtained for ourselves be taken away because of the apathy or fear of a few. We have a saying in the organization to which I belong, the National Federation of the Blind: "We do not want strife or confrontation, but we will do what we have to do. We are simply no longer willing to be second class citizens. They say that there is no discrimination, that the blind are not a minority. But we know who we are, and we will never go back." That says it all. It illustrates our resolve to become a part of the wider general community. There are some who do not believe what we say. They feel that

nothing has changed since blind people were forced to wear donkey ears and fighting village squares for the amusement of the local populous during festivals in

the Middle Ages. I wanted to make it crystal clear that the discussion that was going on in the thread was not simply idle bantering, and that we fully intend to do what we can to reverse the discriminatory policy of the FCC.

Perhaps Carl, you saw what I wrote as strident militancy because you are not used to seeing the blind taking charge of their own lives. If this is true, then I can sympathize. It is a concept that is over half a century old, yet to most of the general population it is still new. I will not make assumptions about you though without knowing you.

You on the other hand have made assumptions about me. You indicate I am a militant. Nothing could be further from the truth. I do not throw bombs nor commit any violence on any person. Equality for the blind I feel, will be longer lasting if the public is educated about our competency and our equality. Your letter gives me the impression that you did not even see the part of my response where I said that all we wished was a chance to try to do the job. I have said it before, but I will say it again here because I intend to share my response to your email with others (Yours will not be shared unless you give me permission to do so, as I respect a person's right to privacy). As in baseball, I call them as I see them. If I believe that some institution or some person is prejudiced I will make that indication. I will not automatically assume that anyone who disagrees with me is a bigot. But when I see bigotry displayed, I will most certainly respond to it. I will try not to offend, but I will say what needs to be said to make my point. That is my right as an American citizen just as it is yours.

73,

--

```
-----
David Milner      | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L   (R/R # 3)
(GeNie) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will NEVER go back!
** Illegitimus Non Carborundum Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) **
-----
```

--

```
David Milner      | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L   (R/R # 3)
(GeNie) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will NEVER go back!
** Illegitimus Non Carborundum Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) **
-----
```

Date: 8 Jun 1993 16:31:58 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!chnews!news@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: blind VEs  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C89DCo.7xq@pacifier.rain.com>  
mikef@pacifier.rain.com (Mike Freeman) writes:

>.....It is my contention that sight is irrelevant,  
>presuming the blind VE is competent (meaning that he has  
>devised alternative techniques to accomplish the tasks of a  
>VE). If he/she is incompetent, than he/she has no business  
>being a VE in the first place!

One has to wonder just how far this process of devising  
"alternative techniques to accomplish the tasks of a VE"  
could be taken.

More particularly, is there any *\*real\** reason why VE's have  
to be licensed amateur radio operators?

The fact that the requirement is written into FCC regulations  
is, at the bottom, purely arbitrary. If a blind ham can  
devise work-arounds to monitoring amateur exams, it seems to  
me that a non-amateur could do the same to compensate for his  
or her supposed lack of technical and operational  
expertise.

One only has to look at amateur testing before the VE system  
was authorized to see *\*exactly\** how this worked. The FCC  
staffers who administered the exams were not experts in  
either manual radiotelegraphy or electronic theory. And, if  
the truth be known, probably didn't have an inkling of what  
the inside of Part 97 was all about. As amateur radio  
operators, they were the epitome of incompetence. And yet,  
the exams they gave were perfectly valid and did test the  
skill and knowledge of the applicants.

The essential skill involved in being a VE is that of test  
administration. If the test can be administered fairly, by  
whatever means necessary to accommodate the limitations of the  
tester or test-taker, then the purpose of the exam has been  
served. It is not readily apparent why possession of an  
amateur radio license of high rank is absolutely necessary to  
accomplish this goal.

+-----+-----+  
| Jim Bromley W5GYJ |



that, and neither is the FCC. So if you want to say that a blind  
VE can function by using a live reader who is certified as a  
competent observer by virtue of being a VE, I don't think the FCC  
would have a problem with that, but then you'd be somewhat redundant.

>Methinks I hear echos of some of the comments about Martin Luther  
>King, Jr., James Farmer, Roy Wilkins, Ralph Abernathy, W.E.B.  
>Dubois ...

Methinks I hear the standard cry of racism being misused in a totally  
unrelated matter.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1993 18:47:40 GMT  
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!  
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!src.honeywell.com!skyler.mavd.honeywell.com!  
estey@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Need to have your license in Minnesota  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In regard to Minnesota State law concerning the requirement for  
an Amateur to carry a copy of his license ....

Minnesota law is clear in that it states transporting or using a  
device capable of receiving .... and in discussing this with some  
law enforcement people, they believe they could confiscate a radio  
that can work at public service frequencies - EVEN IF NOT IN USE. When  
asked if they would actually sieze the radio, even if no other violation  
had occured they said no - not under normal circumstances. In Minnesota,  
the new law is in the Statute Book supplied to peace officers.

Carl

---

Carl Estey		Home Mail Address: 276 Walnut Lane
Amateur Callsign: WA0CQG		Apple Valley, MN 55124
		Business Address: Honeywell Inc.
Phone: Work (612) 542-5136		Flight Systems & Test Operations M/S MN15-2370

FAX (612) 542-6003 | 1625 Zarthan Ave. S., St. Louis Park, MN 55416  
Home (612) 432-0699 | Packet: WA0CQG @ WA0CQG.#SOMSP.MN.USA.NA

The nonsense here is of my own making - no one else would want credit!

-----  
Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1993 20:48:57 GMT  
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!  
rsg1.er.usgs.gov!resdgs1.er.usgs.gov!tbodoh@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Need to have your license in Minnesota  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun8.124740.1@skyler.mavd.honeywell.com>,  
estey@skyler.mavd.honeywell.com writes:

|> In regard to Minnesota State law concerning the requirement for  
|> an Amateur to carry a copy of his license ....  
|>  
|> Minnesota law is clear in that it states transporting or using a  
|> device capable of receiving .... and in discussing this with some  
|> law enforcement people, they believe they could confiscate a radio  
|> that can work at public service frequencies - EVEN IF NOT IN USE. When  
|> asked if they would actually sieze the radio, even if no other violation  
|> had occured they said no - not under normal circumstances. In Minnesota,  
|> the new law is in the Statute Book supplied to peace officers.

|>  
|> Carl  
|>  
|>  
|>  
|> -----

|> Carl Estey | Home Mail Address: 276 Walnut Lane

--  
But - what if the wife (or kid, friend, mechanic, etc) is driving the vehicle  
where a 2M rig with extended receive is installed and the licensed amateur is  
not in the vehicle? I feel that this problem needs to be addressed before it  
happens to someone - "You're where honey? Jail? For what? Ummm... are they  
going to keep the rig? Honey? Honey?.....". I know jail is not likely, but  
adds to the effect...

+++++  
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer  
+  
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +  
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)  
+  
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P  
+

+++++

-----

Date: (null)

From: (null)

A live reader to a blind person is in some ways like an interpreter is to the deaf. That person is there to serve a function. If that function happens to be watching a testing session so that people won't cheat, then that is the function that will be served. In a sense the live reader is an extension of the blind person, and those duties can be performed for a blind VE with the same skill and efficiency that can be brought to the blind schoolteacher.

In my lifetime I've heard all sorts of excuses supported by a legion of tired bromides, for keeping the blind "in their place" and out of the mainstream of activity that is public privilege and duty. The excuses have lost their validity, and their aspersers have lost their credibility.

>>Methinks I hear echos of some of the comments about Martin Luther

>>King, Jr., James Farmer, Roy Wilkins, Ralph Abernathy, W.E.B.

>>Dubois ...

>

>Methinks I hear the standard cry of racism being misused in a totally

>unrelated matter.

Methinks \*I\* hear the statement of one who represents those who refuse to accept facts and common sense when they are \*quite\* evident.

>

>Gary

>

>--

>Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary

>Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary

>534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary

>Lawrenceville, GA 30244 |

Let me make something clear here, if it hasn't become apparent already. I might misspell the odd word here and there, but one thing that is clear is my resolve, and that of a great number of blind and sighted people.

We intend to see to it that the FCC rescinds its discriminatory policy. If others choose to crouch in the dark caves of society's past, they may do so. All that we the blind ask, is that these backward-thinking individuals not waste their waning energies in ever-weakening attempts to deter us from reaching our rightful goals in society's maturing modern day.

If there are things which we can not do, we will accept that fact and go on



with our lives. But we refuse to be barred from attempting these things.  
\*WE\* are the experts on what the blind can do, and we have the determination  
to get it done.

Rest assured that we \*WILL\* win this fight, because the stakes go far beyond  
amateur radio, and we the blind have gone far beyond the limited expectations  
of the fearful, and bigoted few.

--  
David Milner | \*\*\*\*\* | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)  
(GeNie) D.MILNER | \* Moo! \* | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu  
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | \*\*\*\*\* | I know who I am, and I will NEVER go back!  
\*\* Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) \*\*

-----  
Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1993 18:05:27 GMT  
From: rtech!amdahl!amdcad!amdcl2!brian@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <luenii\$nmmt@thumper.cc.utexas.edu>, <luilnfINN41b@west.West.Sun.COM>,  
<C827zu.3sA@pacifier.rain.com>ov  
Subject : Re: Bad News For Blind U.S. Hams :-(

Seems to me that the fundamental issue of blind VE's proctoring exams  
is whether blind VE's can detect cheating. This is part of a bigger  
question regarding job related abilities. We can probably learn from  
previous solutions:

Women were forbidden to join the fire department for years because  
they were considered too physically weak to carry an unconscious  
person out of a building. This is a valid concern, AND it applies  
to men as well. The solution was to add a job related test of  
physical strength and to require all applicants to pass the test.

The same is true of the VE program today. There is currently a  
question about whether a blind person can "observe" the test session  
and detect cheating. We should be able to come up with an appropriate  
"skills" test for all prospective VE's. Such a test would require the  
ability to detect cheating. The catch 22 here is that this kind of  
test can never be objective because it requires another human subject  
to play the "cheater" and be caught.

Anybody want to suggest how such a test would be given? Would such a  
test answer the needs of the FCC and of the blind hams? Is it  
reasonable to require all VE candidates to demonstrate such skills?

As an alternative, we could create (within the VE system) a group of "authorized cheaters" who would cheat flagrantly during an exam session to test the VE's ability to detect cheating. They could even recruit VC's (volunteer cheaters) when their faces become too well known to the VE population. Three missed cheaters in one year and the VE status gets yanked. :-)

Brian McMinn    n5pss    brian.mcminn@amd.com

-----  
Date: 8 Jun 1993 18:18:17 -0500  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!gerald@cc.utexas.edu!doc.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <9306060726.AA03021@hwking.cca.cr.rockwell.com>,  
<C89DCo.7xq@pacifier.rain.com>, <1993Jun8.165024.22139@ke4zv.uucp>

Subject : Re: blind VEs

In article <1993Jun8.165024.22139@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:  
>I've tried to stay out of this, I really have.

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #178  
\*\*\*\*\*